

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

my

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	10. F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,060	,060 11/13/2001		Katherine W. Hughes	SP00-369	3885
22928	7590	02/24/2004		EXAMINER	
CORNII SP-TI-3-		PORATED	WALSH, BRIAN D		
	i IG, NY 148	Y 14831 ART UN		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			3722	9
				DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/008,060	HUGHES, KATHERINE W.				
_Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
<b>→</b>	Brian D. Walsh	3722				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 29 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any						
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canc	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>18</u> would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLEL`	Y to issues which were newly				
⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: <u>18</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>12-17 and 19</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
10. Other:		A. L. WELLINGTON				

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Application No.

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 10/008,060





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The Examiner has considered Applicant's arguments but maintains the rejections cited in the Action, paper no. 9, filed 07 December 2003. Claim 19, the broadest claim in the Application, discloses a method of shaping an end face of a catalyst substrate. Beyond the preamble, only rotating first and second guides, a cutting filament and a cutting orientation are claimed. Such cutting apparatuses are well known in the art, taught by Brown (U.S. Pat. No. 2,972,669, 1957) which includes an inclinable cutting position. Spridco (U.S. Pat. No. 4,782,570, 1988) teaches cutting catalyst substrates similar to the instant invention and Holpp et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,368,726, 2002) teaches a frusto-conical end shape to a catalyst is known and useful. Given the broad nature of independent claim 19, the Examiner has determined that the rejections stand in view of Applicant's arguments. Claim 18, as proposed, overcomes the objection cited in said Action.